

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 4, 8, 10 and 13-15 are amended, Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11 and 12 are cancelled without prejudice and Claims 16-20 are withdrawn, leaving Claims 1, 4, 8-10 and 13-15 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. Particularly, support for amended Claim 1 is at least found in originally filed Claims 1-3. Support for amended Claim 8 is at least found in originally filed Claims 1 and 8 and in the specification at page 21, line 24 through page 22, line 2. Support for amended Claim 10 is at least found in originally filed Claims 10-12. Support for amended Claim 13 is at least found in originally filed Claims 4 and 6. Support for amended Claim 14 is at least found in originally filed Claims 1 and 14 and in the specification at page 21, line 24 through page 22, line 2. Claims 4 and 15 are amended to provide proper dependency and reference to the preamble of parent claims.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 as being unclear so as to preclude a reasonable search of the prior art by the Examiner. Particularly, referring to Figure 8 at page 19, line 11 to page 20, line 7, the Examiner indicates that geometrically, the areal size of the first inclined plane 272 will not be varied (or will be the same) if the angle "alpha" has a substantially identical value and the light reflection sections 276 also have a substantially identical height.

In response, Applicants herein amend the specification to correct the description of the angle "alpha" from being substantially identical in the reflection sections 276 to being varied in accordance with positions of the light reflection sections 276 relative to the cathode ray tube.

Applicant respectfully submits that the specification as amended complies with 37 CFR 1.71. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant objection are respectfully requested.

Drawings

New corrected drawings are required in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). Particularly, Figure 8 currently shows the angle “alpha” having a substantially identical value and the light reflection sections 276 having a substantially identical height as the light reflection section is positioned remoter from the lamp, which as discussed above regarding the objection to the disclosure, is geometrically incorrect. In response, Applicants herein amend Figure 8 to change angle “alpha” from being substantially identical in the reflection sections 276 to being varied in accordance with positions of the light reflection sections 276 relative to the cathode ray tube.

The one (1) amended drawing sheet includes all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet. The one (1) replacement sheet is labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 C.F.R. §1.84(c)). Consideration and entry of the amended Figure 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 6 is hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are rendered moot for this claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4 and 12 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 3, intervening Claim 2 and base Claim 1 have been rewritten into amended Claim 1. Claim 12, intervening Claim 11 and base Claim 10 have been rewritten

into amended Claim 10. Claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 have been accordingly cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 10 are now allowable.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the allowable subject matter in Claim 4. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 4 is amended to depend from Claim 1 and is therefore allowable. As such, Applicants have not rewritten Claim 4 in independent form at this time. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 4 and 10 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Regarding Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 14 and 15 with respect to Suzuki, U.S. Patent No. 6,168,281 (hereinafter "Suzuki")

Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 2 and 11 are hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are rendered moot for these claims.

As discussed above, amended Claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Claims 8 and 14 are amended in independent form to recite, *inter alia*,

"...a light reflecting surface on which a light reflecting pattern is formed to reflect the light provided from the light incident portion..."

wherein the light reflecting pattern includes a plurality of light reflecting sections protruding from the light reflecting surface." [Emphasis added.]

Suzuki discloses that on a front surface 9 of the transparent substrate 2, a light reflection pattern 10 is formed and is made up of grooves 11. (Col. 4, lines 14-18 and Figures 2a-2c and 3.) The light reflection pattern 10 including the grooves 11 clearly does not "protrude" from the surface 9. Therefore, Suzuki fails to disclose a light reflecting surface on which a light reflecting pattern is formed wherein the light reflecting pattern includes a plurality of light reflecting sections protruding from the light reflecting surface of amended Claims 8 and 14.

Thus, Suzuki does not disclose all of the limitations of amended Claims 8 and 14. Accordingly, Suzuki does not anticipate amended Claims 8 and 14. Applicants respectfully

submit that Claims 9 and 15 (as amended) depend from Claims 8 and 14, respectively, are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration of Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15 and allowance of Claims 9 and 15 are respectfully requested.

Regarding Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11 and 14 with respect to Yang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,323,919 (hereinafter “Yang”)

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yang. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 2 and 11 are hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are rendered moot for these claims.

As discussed above, amended Claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Claims 8 and 14 are amended in independent form to recite, *inter alia*,

“...wherein areal sizes of the light reflecting sections are gradually increased by a selected amount such that the areal sizes of the first light reflecting plane and the areal size of the second light reflecting planes are larger as the light reflecting section is remoter from the light incident portion.”

Yang discloses forming the planar surfaces 14 and the slanted surfaces 15 such that the difference “d” between the apex line 17 and the bottom line 18 (hereinafter referred to as depth) gradually increases from left to right. (Col. 5, lines 11-15.) That is, Yang does not specifically disclose that the areal sizes of the planar surfaces 14 and the areal size of the slanted surfaces 15 are larger from left to right. Therefore, Yang fails to disclose the areal sizes of the first light reflecting plane and the areal size of the second light reflecting planes are larger as the light reflecting section is remoter from the light incident portion of amended Claims 8 and 14.

Thus, Yang does not disclose all of the limitations of amended Claims 8 and 14. Accordingly, Yang does not anticipate amended Claims 8 and 14. Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claims 8 and 14 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 8, 10 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Ishihara et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0019379 (hereinafter “Ishihara”).

Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 5 and 7 are hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are rendered moot for these claims.

Claim 13 is substantially revised to recite subject matter as previously included in Claims 4 and 6 of the originally filed claims:

“The liquid crystal display device of claim 10, wherein the light reflecting sections each have a substantially identical height.”

Claim 13 now depends upon Claim 10. As discussed above, Claim 10 is allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 13 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claim 13 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon-Copp
Amy Bizon-Copp

Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: March 13, 2006

Application No. 10/763,758
Response dated: March 13, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 12, 2005

Amendment to the Drawings

Please amend Figure 8 to change the angles “ α ” in all three light reflection sections 276 to be “ α_1 ,” “ α_2 ” and “ α_n ,” respectively. No new matter has been added. A clean replacement sheet is provided herewith.